



## Comparison of resource and energy yield assessment procedures

Mortensen, Niels Gylling; Ejsing Jørgensen, Hans

*Published in:*  
Proceedings

*Publication date:*  
2011

*Document Version*  
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)

*Citation (APA):*  
Mortensen, N. G., & Ejsing Jørgensen, H. (2011). Comparison of resource and energy yield assessment procedures. In *Proceedings European Wind Energy Association (EWEA)*.  
<http://www.ewea.org/index.php?id=2102>

---

### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.


# Comparison of Resource and Energy Yield Assessment Procedures

Niels G. Mortensen and Hans E. Jørgensen  
Wind Energy Division, Risø DTU

*EWEA Wind Resource Assessment Technology Workshop 2011*


## Acknowledgements


- The data pack used for the comparison was made available by Renewable Energy Systems Ltd. (RES); thanks in particular to Gerd Habenicht, Mike Anderson and Karen-Anne Hutton.
- The 37 sets of results reported here were submitted by 35 organisations from 16 countries; thanks to all of the teams for making the comparison and presentation possible! See [www.ewea.org](http://www.ewea.org) for more info.



# Outline

- Participants in the comparison
- Case study wind farm
  - Wind farm and turbine data
  - Wind-climatological inputs
  - Topographical inputs
- Comparison of results and models
  - Long-term wind @ 50 m
  - Long-term wind @ 60 m
  - Reference energy yield
  - Gross energy yield
  - Potential energy yield
  - Net energy yield  $P_{50}$
  - Net energy yield  $P_{90}$
- Summary and conclusions






## Uncertainty and bias in wind farm predictions

Reliable energy yield predictions are obtained when the bias and the uncertainty are both low. In the present comparison exercise, the 'true value' is not known (to me at least ;-)

## Who responded?

- 37 organisations from 16 countries submitted results
  - consultancy (18), developer (7), wind turbine manufacturer (5), electricity generator/utility (3), R&D/university (2), component manufacturer (1), service provider (1)
- Names of organisations
  - 2EN, 3E, CENER, Center for Renewable Energy Sources (CRES), Det Norske Veritas (DNV), DONG Energy A/S, Dulas, Ecofys, EMD International, Eolfi - Veolia, ESB International, GAMESA Innovation & Technology, GL Garrad Hassan, ITOCHU Techno-Solutions Corporation, Kjeller Vindteknikk AS, METEODYN, Mott MacDonald, MS-Techno Co. Ltd., Natural Power, Nordex, ORTECH Power, Prevailing Ltd., REpower Systems AG, RES – Renewable Energy Systems Ltd, RES Americas Inc., RWE Innogy, Samsung Heavy Industries, SgurrEnergy, Suzlon Wind Energy A/S, The Wind Consultancy Service, Tractebel Engineering, Vestas, WIND-consult GmbH, WindGuard, WindSim AS, Windtest Grevenbroich GmbH.







## Simplified case study

### ***Which results can be compared?***

- Observed and long-term estimated wind climates
  - Site measurements and long-term reference station
- Flow modelling results in hilly to complex terrain
  - Terrain defined in 20×20 km<sup>2</sup> domain by 50-m grid point elevations
- Wake model results
  - Wind farm layout and wind turbine generator data
- Technical losses estimates
  - Electrical design of wind farm
- Uncertainty estimates


### ***What is not taken into account?***

- Roughness and roughness changes
- Forest effects due to nearby forestry
- Shelter effects due to nearby obstacles
- Stability effects over different terrain surfaces






## 28-MW wind farm

- 14 wind turbines
  - Rated power: 2 MW
  - Hub height: 60 m
  - Rotor diameter: 80 m
  - Air density:  $1.225 \text{ kg m}^{-3}$
  - Spacing: irregular,  $3.7D - 4.8D$  to nearest neighbouring turbine
- Site meteorological mast
  - Wind speed @ 49.6 and 35 m
  - Std. deviation @ 49.6 and 35 m
  - Wind direction @ 33.6 m a.g.l.
- Reference station
  - Wind speed and direction



# Wind-climatological inputs




## Site data (4y)

- 2002-09 to 2006-10
- Recovery 92%

## Reference data (14y)

- Monthly  $U$  1993-2006
- Hourly  $U$  and  $D$  from 2002-09 to 07-01
- Observed Wind Climate from 1993-2001

# Topographical inputs



# Data analysis & presentation

## Data material

- Results spreadsheets from 37 teams
- Additional questions to nine teams

## Data analysis

- Quality control
- Reformatting of data
- Calculation of missing numbers, but no comprehensive reanalysis!

## Data presentation

- Team results for each parameter
- Overall distribution of all results
  - Normal distribution fitted to the results
  - Statistics (mean, standard deviation, variation coefficient, range)
- Comparison of methods where possible



## Results

1. LT wind @ 50 m = Measured wind  $\pm$  [long-term correlation effects]  
– comparison of long-term correlation methods
2. LT wind @ 60 m = LT wind @ 50 m + [wind profile effects]  
– comparison of vertical extrapolation methods
3. Gross AEP = Reference AEP  $\pm$  [terrain effects]  
– comparison of flow models
4. Potential AEP = Gross AEP – [wake losses]  
– comparison of wake models
5. Net AEP ( $P_{50}$ ) = Potential AEP – [technical losses]  
– comparison of technical losses estimates
6. Net AEP ( $P_{90}$ ) = Net AEP ( $P_{50}$ ) –  $1.282 \times$  [uncertainty estimate]  
– comparison of uncertainty estimates

## Which tools have been used?

- Data analysis – long-term correlation
  - MCP (matrix method, hourly values, monthly means), correlation with NWP or reanalysis data (2), NOAA-GSOD index (1), none (3)
- Vertical extrapolation
  - Observed power law/log law profile (19), WAsP (10), WindSim (2), unspecified CFD (2), NWP (1)
- Horizontal extrapolation – flow models
  - WAsP (23), MS3DJH (2), WindSim (2), unspecified CFD (2), NWP (1), MS-Micro/3 (1), other (1)
- Wake models
  - WAsP PARK (17), WindPRO PARK (8), WindFarmer Eddy Viscosity (5), Ainslie Eddy Viscosity (3), EWTS II (2), CFD Actuator (1), Confidential (1)

## Long-term wind at the meteorological mast

Wind @ 50 m = Measured wind  $\pm$  [long-term corr. effects]

## Long-term correlation effects

Data points used = 36 (of 37)



Team 19 result disregarded

Mean long-term effect = **1.8%**

Std. deviation = **2.5%** (139%)


Range = -2.4 to 10.6% (713%)

(measured  $U_{50}$  of  $8.5 \text{ ms}^{-1}$  assumed)






## Comparison of correlation methods (caution!)



## Comparison of correlation methods (caution!)



## LT mean wind speed @ 49.6 m

Data points used = 37 (of 37)


All teams report results

Mean wind speed = **8.7 ms<sup>-1</sup>**

Std. deviation = **0.2 ms<sup>-1</sup>** (2.5%)

Range = 8.3 to 9.4 ms<sup>-1</sup> (13%)

(statistics without single high outlier)





## **Long-term wind at the meteorological mast**

Wind @ 60 m = Wind @ 50 m + [wind profile effects]



## Wind profile and shear exponent



Data points used = 35 (of 37)


Team 2 and 19 report no results

Mean shear exponent = **0.166** (1/6)

Std. deviation = **0.037** (22%)

Range = 0.015 to 0.237 (133%)

## Comparison of vertical extrapolation methods



## LT mean wind speed @ 60 m



Data points used = 35 (of 37)

Team 2 and 19 report no results

Mean wind speed = **8.9 ms<sup>-1</sup>**

Std. deviation = **0.2 ms<sup>-1</sup>** (2.5%)

Range = 8.6 to 9.7 ms<sup>-1</sup> (13%)



## Turbulence intensity @ 49.6 m



Data points used = 35 (of 37)

Team 31 and 35 report no results

Mean turb. intensity = **9.4%**

Std. deviation = **0.8%** (8%)

Range = 8% to 12% (43%)



## Turbulence intensity @ 60 m



Data points used = 29 (of 37)

Eight teams report no results

Mean turb. intensity = **9.2%**

Std. deviation = **0.7%** (7.8%)

Range = 8.1% to 12% (38%)





## Gross energy yield of wind farm

Gross AEP = Reference AEP  $\pm$  [terrain effects]

## Reference yield of wind farm



Data points used = 34 (of 37)

Team 28, 29 and 37 report no results

Mean reference yield = **116 GWh**

Std. deviation = **7.7 GWh** (6.6%)

Range = 98 to 131 GWh (29%)



# Topographical effects



Data points used = 32 (of 37)

Team 2, 19, 28, 29, 37 report no result


Mean terrain effect = **5.1 %**

Std. deviation = **7.5%** (147%)

Range = -6 to 22% (554%)



## Comparison of flow models



# Gross energy yield of wind farm



Data points used = 36 (of 37)

Team 2 reports no result

Mean gross yield = **121 GWh**

Std. deviation = **3.5 GWh** (2.9%)

Range = 113 to 127 GWh (12%)



## Potential energy yield of wind farm

Potential AEP = Gross AEP – [wake losses]



## Wake losses



Data points used = 36 (of 37)

Team 19 reports no result


Mean wake loss = **6.1%**

Std. deviation = **0.8%** (13%)

Range = 4.5% to 8.1% (59%)



## Comparison of wake models



# Potential energy yield of wind farm



Data points used = 35 (of 37)

Team 2 and 19 report no results

Mean potential yield = **113 GWh**

Std. deviation = **3.6 GWh** (3.2%)

Range = 104 to 120 GWh (14%)



## Net energy yield of wind farm ( $P_{50}$ )

Net AEP ( $P_{50}$ ) = Potential AEP – [technical losses]

## Technical losses

Data points used = 34 (of 37)


Team 2, 8 and 9 report no results

Mean total loss = **9.2%**



Std. deviation = **2.9%** (32%)

Range = 5 to 20% (159%)

Median value = 8.8%



## Technical losses by type





## Net energy yield of wind farm ( $P_{50}$ )



Data points used = 34 (of 37)

Team 2, 8 and 9 report no results

Mean net yield = **103 GWh**

Std. deviation = **4.5 GWh** (4.4%)

Range = 91 to 113 GWh (21%)



# Capacity factor



Data points used = 34 (of 37)

Team 2, 8 and 9 report no results

Mean capacity factor = **42.1%**

Std. deviation = **1.8%** (4.4%)

Range = 37 to 46% (21%)





## Net energy yield of wind farm ( $P_{90}$ )

$$\text{Net AEP } (P_{90}) = \text{Net AEP } (P_{50}) - 1.282 \times [\text{uncertainty}]$$



# Uncertainty estimates

Data points used = 35 (of 37)  
Team 2 and 9 report no results

Mean uncertainty = **11%**  
Std. deviation = **3.6%** (34%)  
Range = 6 to 20% (129%)  
(Calculated from  $P_{50}$  and  $P_{90}$ )



# Uncertainty estimates by type (caution!!!)



## Net energy yield of wind farm ( $P_{90}$ )



Data points used = 35 (of 37)

Team 2 and 9 report no results

Mean net yield = **89 GWh**


Std. deviation = **6.4 GWh** (7.2%)

Range = 73 to 99 GWh (29%)





## Comparison of $P_{90}$ versus business sector




## Summary of wind farm key figures


		Mean	$\sigma$	CV*	Min	Max
Reference yield	GWh	116	7.7	6.6	98	131
Topographic effects	%	5.1	7.5	147	-6.0	22
Gross energy yield	GWh	121	3.5	2.9	113	127
Wake effects	%	6.1	0.8	13	4.5	8.1
Potential yield	GWh	113	3.6	3.2	104	120
Technical losses	%	9.2	2.9	32	5	20
Net energy yield $P_{50}$	GWh	103	4.5	4.4	91	113
Uncertainty	%	11	3.6	34	6	20
Net energy yield $P_{90}$	GWh	89	6.4	7.2	73	99

\* coefficient of variation in per cent

# Steps in the prediction process




## Summary and conclusions



- We must all draw the conclusions
- Steps that add little to the spread
  - Vertical extrapolation
  - Flow modelling
  - Wake modelling
- Which steps could be improved?
  - Long-term correlation
  - Technical loss estimation
  - Uncertainty estimation
- What else could be improved?
  - Definition and usage of concepts
  - Engineering best practices
  - Guidelines for reporting

## How does this compare to TPWind 2030?



## Future comparisons?

Should there be regular (yearly) comparison exercises?

- Wind farm site with roughnesses and roughness changes
- Wind farm site where vertical extrapolation is more important
- Wind farm site where stability effects are important (coastal site)
- Offshore wind farm site
- Forested wind farm site
- Complex terrain wind farm site
- Real wind farm(s) with production data

Future comparison exercises could be more focussed in order to highlight specific topics.

*— Thank you for your attention!*